

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and the newly cited reference. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the comments made herein is respectfully requested.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claims 11-13.

Claims 8-10 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,937,675 to Stucker. Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Stucker does not disclose a compressor and a condenser forming a heat pump which alone provides energy required for evaporation of liquid in the evaporator chamber, as recited in claim 8. Rather, Stucker discloses that the evaporator preferably includes a heat exchanger in combination with a pressure regulator to evaporate the pressured fluid solvent into a vapor or gas state. (Col. 9, lines 63-66). Stucker further states that the heat exchanger of the evaporator may be a heat pump configuration, a combination of heating and cooling coils, or any other conventional temperature control device. The pressure regulator can be a compressor pump for increasing pressure within the evaporator. (Col. 10, lines 8-14). Once the pressurized solvent is evaporated, a condenser 54 can then be utilized to liquefy the vapor from the evaporator 42. There is nothing in Stucker which discloses, teaches, or suggests that the referenced heat pump configuration is formed by the compressor and the condenser, which alone provides the energy required for distillation of the treatment gas in the evaporator. Moreover, because the heat exchanger is referenced as a separate unit, it is submitted that Stucker actually teaches away from the present invention. If the compressor pump and condenser of Stucker formed a heat pump, the separate heat exchange component would not be necessary.

The Examiner points to heat exchanger 205 (Fig. 2) as being equivalent to the claimed heat pump. However, not only is the heat exchanger 205 illustrated as a separate component from the pressure regulator (compressor pump) 210, in this embodiment, the evaporator 42 and the condenser 54 components have been removed and replaced by an integral unit 200.

Likewise, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 8, Stucker does not disclose a method wherein the compressor and the condenser provide all of the energy

Appl. No. 09/936,828
Amdt. Dated August 25, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 27, 2004

required for evaporation of the liquid state treatment gas in the evaporator chamber.

Because Stucker does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in claims 8 and 14, Stucker cannot anticipate such claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33897.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP



Una L. Schumacher, Reg. No. 48,998

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700
Date: August 25, 2004